

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 14-291

Filed: July 8, 2015

\*\*\*\*\*

**UNPUBLISHED**

AMY LEA, as Personal Representative  
of the Estate of MICHAEL LEA,

\*

Petitioner,

\*

Special Master Hamilton-Fieldman

v.

\*

Attorneys' Fees and Costs; Reasonable  
Amount Requested to which Respondent  
Does Not Object.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES,

\*

Respondent.

\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Diana Sedar, Maglio Christopher and Toale, PA, Sarasota, FL, for Petitioner.

Jennifer Reynaud, United States Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

### **DECISION**<sup>1</sup>

On April 11, 2014, Amy Lea ("Petitioner"), as the Personal Representative of the Estate of Michael Lea, filed a petition for compensation under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, 42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-1 *et seq.* (2006) ("Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleged that Michael Lea suffered from Guillain-Barré Syndrome ("GBS") as a result of an influenza vaccine he received on October 28, 2011. Petition ("Pet") at 1-2. On May 13, 2015, the undersigned issued a decision dismissing the case for insufficient proof.

On July 6, 2015, the parties filed a Stipulation of Fact Concerning Attorneys' Fees and Costs. Pursuant to their Stipulation, the parties have agreed to an award of \$14,348.70 in attorneys' fees and costs. In accordance with General Order Number 9, Petitioner represents that she has not incurred any costs in pursuit of her claim.

The undersigned finds that this petition was brought in good faith and that there existed a reasonable basis for the claim. Therefore, an award for fees and costs is appropriate, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 300aa-15(b) and (e)(1). Further, the proposed amount seems reasonable and

---

<sup>1</sup> The undersigned intends to post this unpublished decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107 347, § 205, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (codified as amended at 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2006)). As provided by Vaccine Rule 18(b), each party has 14 days within which to file a motion for redaction "of any information furnished by that party (1) that is trade secret or commercial or financial information and is privileged or confidential, or (2) that are medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy." In the absence of such motion, the entire decision will be available to the public. *Id.*

appropriate. **Accordingly, the undersigned hereby awards the amount of \$14,348.70, in the form of a check made payable jointly to Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel, Diana Stadelnikas Sedar, of the law firm of Maglio, Christopher & Toale, PA.**

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court **SHALL ENTER JUDGMENT** in accordance with the terms of the parties' stipulation.<sup>2</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Lisa D. Hamilton-Fieldman  
Lisa D. Hamilton-Fieldman  
Special Master

---

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment is expedited by the parties' joint filing of notice renouncing the right to seek review.